

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
PASSENGER SEXUAL ASSAULT  
LITIGATION

Case No. [23-md-03084-CRB](#)

This Order Relates To:  
ALL ACTIONS

**ORDER DENYING UBER'S  
MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM  
NONDISPOSITIVE PRETRIAL  
ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 1876

Uber's motion for relief from Magistrate Judge Cisneros's Order Regarding Time Period for Discovery (dkt. 1816) is denied. As Judge Cisneros said in a later discovery order, the challenged order should not be understood as suggesting that an end date would never be appropriate, just that it was too soon to know what the end date should be. *See* Order Regarding Second Joint Letter Addressing Time Period for Discovery (dkt. 1879) at 4. As the Court sees it, that is simply prudence, and is not contrary to law.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: December 6, 2024



CHARLES R. BREYER  
United States District Judge